

REMARKS

Claims 21-23, 26-31, and 34-46 are pending in this application. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 22-29 were objected to for informalities. Claims 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,240,444 (“Fin”). Claims 24, 25, 32, 33 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin in view of United States Patent No. 5,774,670 (“Montulli”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 21-23, 26-31 and 40 have been amended. Claims 24-25 and 32-33 have been canceled. Claims 41-46 have been added.

Interview Summary

On April 7, 2008, Examiner Aaron Strange and Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Strange agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

Claim Objections

Claims 22-23 and 26-29 have been amended to correct minor informalities.

Claim Rejections Under § 102(e) and § 103(a)

Claims 21-23 and 26-29

Claims 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin. Independent Claim 21 as amended relates to a host client computer for establishing a shared view for sharing content computer. The host client computer includes a browser that issues a request comprising a locator for content on a server and a communications interface to a communications network. Claim 21 further recites a shared view engine for receiving an identification of a slave client computer, intercepting a request issued by the browser, determining required cookie data on the host client associated with the request, and providing, via the communications link to the slave client, a message comprising the locator and the required cookie data.

In particular, if the communications network is the Internet, when the user at the host client issues a request to a Web site, the shared view engine on the host client obtains or intercepts the URL for the requested Web site from the browser. The shared view engine on the host client sends the URL via the communications link to a shared view engine on identified slave clients (the clients may provide the URL on their respective browsers, which causes the same content to be downloaded on the slave clients as the host client, thereby allowing both the host and slave clients to view the same content).

With respect to the claim element of determining required cookie data on the host client, in many applications the host client can only view certain Web sites if it has certain required cookie data. Cookie data for the host client is included in its cookie file. Presumably, the slave clients do not have the required cookie data in their cookie files. In this case, the shared view engine must send not only the URL for the Web site, but also any required cookie data to the shared view engines on the slave clients. The shared view engines on the slave clients will then update the respective cookie files of the slave clients. In this way, the slave clients will have all the required permissions to access whatever Web sites the host client is viewing. In addition, claim 21 recites that the communication link between the host client and slave client utilize a tunneling protocol.

The Examiner cites Fin as anticipating claim 21. Fin relates to an Internet page sharing system for clients over a network. A Web sharing manager of a receiving sharing client receives duplicated events (e.g., browser requests) and messages from a web sharing manager of a source sharing client, which causes the browser of a receiving sharing client to execute the duplicate event/messages and which causes the same web page to be displayed and controlled on all of the sharing clients. All clients, which are computers, include a Web browser, a Web sharing user interface, a redirector (e.g., a common client interface (CCI) redirector), a message redirector and a Web sharing manager. The source client utilizes a redirector to send duplicate events generated by the browser of the source client to one or more receiving clients. The redirector of the receiving clients causes received events to be processed appropriately and routed to the browser in the receiving client for execution.

For example, when a user/client opens a new Web document by explicitly specifying a URL of the document or by clicking a hyperlink to a URL document, the browser sends an event requesting a page from the Web server through a TCP/IP interface. The CCI redirector

is pre-registered for monitoring events such as OpenURL to the operating system, which places the event in a queue. The event is eventually routed to the CCI redirector which causes the event to be routed through a web sharing manager and through a network interface over the network to shared receiving clients.

As amended, claim 21 is clearly not anticipated by Fin since that claim now includes the limitation of determining required cookie data on the host client associated with the request, and providing a message comprising the locator and the required cookie data to the slave client. Fin by the Examiner's own admission fails to disclose the exchange of cookie data between a host client and slave client.

With respect to the transmission of cookie data, the Examiner cites Montulli arguing it would have been an advantageous addition to Fin "since it would have allowed state information such as user login information to be shared with the slave computers, permitting the slave computers to access the page when they did not have the appropriate cookie stored locally".

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Montulli discloses only the transfer of state information between a client computer system and a **server** computer system, not between a host client and a slave client. The difference is significant. In the former case, cookie data is transferred automatically as part of a URL request to the server itself. In the latter case, the host client must perform the affirmative step of determining required cookie data associated with a URL request, retrieving cookie data from, for example, a cookie file on the host and causing that required cookie data to be transferred to the slave client via a communication link. Montulli does not teach or suggest the step of determining required cookie data on a host client and this step is not inherent as it is not performed automatically as part of a URL request. Moreover, as recited in claim 21, the transmission link between the host client and slave client utilizes a tunneling protocol, which is not taught or suggested in either Fin or Montulli.

In light of the fact that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the recited limitations, claim 21 should be allowed. Claims 22-23 and 26-29 depend from claim 21 and

therefore include all the limitations of claim 21. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 21, claims 22-23 and 26-29 should be allowed.

Claims 30-31 and 34-39

Claims 30-31 and 34-39 were rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Fin or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fin in view of Montulli. Claim 30 as amended includes limitations similar to claim 21. Thus, at least for the reasons stated with respect to claim 21, claim 30 should be allowed. Claims 31 and 34-39 depend from claim 30 and therefore include all the limitations of claim 30. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 30, claims 31 and 34-39 should be allowed.

Claim 40

Claim 40 was rejected over 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fin in view of Montulli. Claim 40 relates to a system for sharing shared views of a Web page. As amended claim 40 includes limitations similar to claims 1 and further includes the limitations of a slave shared view engine for receiving a message from the host client computer, which updates a cookie file on the slave client computer using the required cookie data from the host client. Claim 40 further recites that upon a receipt of a termination signal, the slave shared view engine terminates the communication link with the host computer and restores the cookie file to an original state. Neither Fin or Montulli alone or in combination teaches or suggests updating a cookie file on a slave client and restoring the cookie file upon receipt of a termination signal.

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest the recited limitations, claim 40 should be allowed.

DOCKET NO.: 126608.03 / MSFT-1210
Application No.: 10/068,816
Office Action Dated: January 24, 2008

PATENT

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: April 24, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439